UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/539,994	06/17/2005	Michael Rosenbauer	2002P01290WOUS	8036
	7590 10/21/200 PPLIANCES CORPOI	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD NEW BERN, NC 28562			GOLIGHTLY, ERIC WAYNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NBN-IntelProp@bshg.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/539,994	ROSENBAUER, MICHAEL		
Examiner		Art Unit		
Eric Golightly		1792		

	Eric Golightly	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The REPLY FILED <u>os October 2009</u> PAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i	j).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter			appeal. Since a				
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	thin the time period set forth in 37	SFR 41.37(a).					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			Cause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		_ 20.011/,					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: <u>No amendments are presently proposed.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 20 and 21.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>23-42</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
7. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
/Michael Kornakov/	/F C /						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	/E. G./ Examiner, Art Unit 1792						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that: 1) 10039408 to Zucholl ("Zucholl") does not teach or suggest using dosing device data; 2 WO 0032864 to Mourad ("Mourad") does not teach or suggest packaging of a dosing device; and 3) it would not have been obvious to the skilled artisan to associate information concerning a dosing device with the packaging of the dosing device.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because: 1 and 2) One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is Mourad, not Zucholl, which is relied upon to provide the feature of using dosing device data (see Office action mailed 7/7/2009 at page 3, second paragraph, citing EPO machine translation of Mourad at, inter alia, paragraphs beginning, "The parts of the wash program" and "The detergent dosage represents"). Further, it is Zucholl, not Mourad, which is relied upon to provide the feature of packaging of a dosing device (see Office action mailed 7/7/2009 at page 3, first paragraph, citing EPO machine translation of Zucholl detailed description, paragraph beginning "In an other [sic] particularly favourable embodiment a reading"); and 3) as discussed in Office action mailed 7/7/2009 at page 4, first paragraph, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that the information be associated with the packaging of the dosing device in order to enhance operator and bar card reading of the information.